



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/252,326	02/18/1999	MARK G. PRESTOY	98-906	4365
32127	7590 06/17/2003			
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC. C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSON 600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE			EXAMINER	
			SHANG, ANNAN Q	
MAILCODE I IRVING, TX			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ikvino, ix	75050		2614	10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/252,326	PRESTOY, MARK O	} .			
:	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Annan Q Shang	2614				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the (correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 30 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Applexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper repich places the application.	oly to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions.	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on SILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S 136(a) and the appropriate	See MPEP			
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C	FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal					
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered						
(a) _ they raise new issues that would require furt		(see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	•					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fapplication in condition for allowance because: §	for reconsideration has been con See Continuation Sheet.	sidered but does NC	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims to			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-26.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Exam	niner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·				
10. Other:						



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been considered bu are not persuasive in view of the following reasons: with respect to independent claims 1 and 17 applicant argues that although the processing device 2 of Egawa, accesses the video data in parallel from the storage devices the processing device is serially connected to the personal computer 6 as noted in figure 1. As clearly shown in figure 1, a couple of personal computers transferring data from processing device 2 to the multiplexing device/switching unit 7. Furthermore it can be clearly seen in figure 1, that additional storage device, processing modules and personal computers, can further be implemented in Egawa's system and where each personal computer transfers information independently to the multiplexing device/switching unit 7. Furthermore this is clearly within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art. Examiner is therefore not persuaded by Applicant's arguments and hence the rejections as set forth in the Final Office Action, still read on the limitations as claimed.

JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600